

2401

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FERNALD
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROJECT
OCTOBER 29, 1991 COMMUNITY MEETING**

10/29/91

98
TRANSCRIPT



2401

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
FERNALD ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROJECT
OCTOBER 29, 1991
COMMUNITY MEETING

1 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Good evening and
2 welcome. My name is Teressa Kwiatkowski, and I am
3 with the Department of Energy. I'm the Public
4 Information Officer here at the Fernald site. I'm
5 happy to see so many of you tonight. DOE is
6 getting very popular these days. I want to thank
7 you in advance for your cooperation and
8 participation this evening.

9 Before we get started, I would like
10 to point out a few items of interest. On the
11 information table in the back of the room you'll
12 find copies of fact sheets on each of the site's
13 operable units, copies of the latest edition of the
14 Fernald Project Cleanup Report, information on the
15 Fernald Environmental Information Center, copies of
16 the Amended Consent Agreement, and EPA comment
17 cards on the Amended Consent Agreement. For your
18 information, there's been a public comment period
19 on the Amended Consent Agreement, and it's run
20 through the month of October, and comments will be
21 accepted up until October 31st.

22 If we follow our agenda, tonight
23 we'll start off with DOE's new Site Manager at
24 Fernald, Bob Tiller. Bob will share with us his

1 perspective on the future of the Fernald office.
2 And following Bob we'll have Jerry Westerbeck,
3 DOE's Deputy Manager of Fernald, and he will give
4 us a site office overview. Finally, we will have
5 Jack Craig, DOE's Branch Chief for Environmental
6 Restoration, and he will provide us with a complete
7 status report on the cleanup.

8 Before we move on to the public forum
9 segment, we'll adjourn for a short break and a much
10 deserved break, that will be a long session.
11 During the public forum, the US EPA, Ohio EPA, and
12 FRESH are invited to offer us their comments.
13 Immediately following the forum, a question and
14 answer session will be open for discussion. I ask
15 for your express cooperation in reserving your
16 questions for that time. This will serve all of us
17 a need for time and continuity. Also, when you ask
18 a question, please, please step up to a microphone,
19 otherwise your questions cannot be properly
20 addressed.

21 Lastly, you'll notice some question
22 cards have been distributed on your chairs. These
23 are by no means meant to substitute for questions
24 by the group, but rather to serve as a tool if any

1 of you are on the shy side or would prefer to
2 maintain their anonymity. Please bring those
3 question cards to the information table off to my
4 left during the break. We would like to reach as
5 many of you as possible this evening.

6 At this point I'll turn you over to
7 Bob Tiller.

8 MR. TILLER: Thank you, Teressa.
9 I'm going to try and give a DOE talk without using
10 even one viewgraph. I think I can do that because
11 I'm not expected to know much yet. I would like to
12 echo her welcome and say I'm pleased with what
13 appears to be a good turnout. It was just a few
14 weeks ago I was being welcomed to Fernald myself,
15 so my remarks will be brief. But I would like to
16 share with you a few of the observations and
17 thoughts I have.

18 One, my charter here is to be
19 instrumental in developing a significantly enhanced
20 DOE staff and presence, and you may ask what does
21 that mean. In order for us to do as the Department
22 of Energy what is being requested of us today, we
23 need additional resources. In addition, we get a
24 number of resources from DOE headquarters and a

1 number of matrix staff support out of the Oak Ridge
2 operations office. It is intended that those be
3 consolidated at this office over a period of
4 several years, and that this will become a
5 stand-alone, self-sufficient office. That is an
6 immensely enjoyable mandate and one that many, many
7 DOE managers have not had for many years. I can
8 tell you I am having a lot of fun so far. It is
9 going to be a challenge, but it is enjoyable.

10 Secondly, I will say that I have been
11 impressed with the dedication and knowledge level
12 of the people involved in the project so far. I
13 found a group of people on both the contractors and
14 the Department of Energy side that understand the
15 mission here and are dedicated to doing it. It is
16 a long-term mission and it is anticipated to cost
17 on the order of 10 billion or more dollars over the
18 next 20 or so years. The fact that expenses are
19 anticipated in this range and the Department of
20 Energy has made a management decision to give this
21 office priority -- in the Department of Energy,
22 just to get additional full-time equivalent
23 employees is always competition amongst various
24 sites. I think the fact that I have been given

1 that charter is an indication of the priority that
2 the top level DOE management places upon getting
3 this job done.

4 And as I understand the format, that
5 was going to be my introduction. Glad to take
6 questions when we get to the open part of the
7 program. Thank you.

8 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Thank you, Bob.
9 Next we have Jerry Westerbeck.

10 MR. WESTERBECK: Thank you,
11 Teressa.

12 On August 23rd we officially changed
13 the name of the site to the Fernald Environmental
14 Management Project. This was yet another clear
15 signal concerning DOE's commitment to environmental
16 restoration. We were particularly pleased to have
17 on hand John C. Tuck, the Under Secretary of the
18 U.S. Department of Energy. While Mr. Tuck conveyed
19 his appreciation to all those who worked at the
20 site in all the years past, he also spoke about the
21 future. As Mr. Tuck stated, the Fernald
22 Environmental Management Project will be on the
23 cutting edge of environmental restoration. What
24 occurs here will have a great impact on the

1 environmental restoration throughout the country.

2 I have two more slides, trying to
3 keep the number of slides down, Graham. Three
4 bullets on each slide, items that I thought might
5 be of particular interest to you before I turned it
6 over to Jack Craig with more specifics on the
7 environmental restoration program.

8 The issue of public water, we just
9 received a consultant's report that was prepared
10 for the Hamilton County Department of Public Works
11 and given by the consultant to the Hamilton County
12 Commissioners. After their review of it, they
13 passed it to us just recently for our review.
14 After we have a chance to look at it, we plan to
15 discuss the details of the consultant study with
16 both the Hamilton County Department of Public Works
17 and with our counterparts at DOE headquarters.

18 I think I can reiterate a comment
19 made at the last community meeting in that DOE
20 stands behind our commitment to support the project
21 monetarily with a contribution deemed to be our
22 fair share of, let's say the total project to bring
23 public water to the entire area.

24 The D&D facility, I think there was a

1 public release on this, but I thought since it's
2 going to play an important role in the future
3 cleanup at the site, I might just want to talk
4 about it again. Back in May we awarded a four and
5 a half million dollar contract to Wise Construction
6 of Dayton, Ohio. That facility, the
7 decommissioning and decontamination facility, will
8 feature modern industrial cleaning and
9 environmental control equipment to remove
10 radioactive contamination from vehicles, tools,
11 machinery, and other metal used at the site. The
12 current status of this project is that the
13 foundations have been poured, the underslab
14 mechanical and electrical work is being completed
15 now, and the placing or pouring of the floor slab
16 has begun. So pretty soon we'll be able to see it
17 starting to come out of the ground. Current
18 schedule for completion is November of '92.

19 The third item, we mentioned a couple
20 of times in the past the DOE Westinghouse School of
21 Environmental Excellence. As you probably
22 remember, we hosted the first two schools here in
23 the area, and the third session of the School of
24 Environmental Excellence has just graduated another

1 class. This session was held out at Hanford in the
2 State of Washington. We had seven of our local
3 Westinghouse employees attend this course. They
4 graduated last Friday.

5 Another school that we're
6 particularly excited about is called the School of
7 Applied Remediation, and it's held at the
8 University of Findlay. Seventeen union employees
9 attended this three-week session. They practiced
10 cleaning up various spills and leaks on the sealid
11 and the waste site near the campus. Also the
12 employees received training on applicable
13 environmental law. I think many of you probably
14 saw in the Enquirer pictures and a pretty good
15 explanatory article on that course. Graduation,
16 they completed the course last Friday, but tomorrow
17 we will actually have graduation ceremonies at the
18 University of Findlay, and Leo Duffy will be
19 participating both as a speaker and in the actual
20 graduation exercise.

21 Knowing how busy Leo Duffy is, I
22 think the times we've had him out here to the site
23 and the fact that he is flying in tonight, driving
24 out to Findlay tonight, going to spend all day

1 there tomorrow, driving back tomorrow night, and
2 then fly back to Washington the next day speaks
3 very highly of his interest in remediation and
4 interest in the Fernald site in particular and his
5 interest in the employees and making sure that when
6 contractors, when employees do remediation work,
7 restoration work, that it's done with the latest
8 knowledge and most up-to-date skills. So we are
9 very encouraged with our employees being able to
10 participate in this remediation course up at
11 Findlay.

12 One last item in the area of training
13 and education, we are considering very seriously
14 offering night courses during the Summer of '92,
15 next summer. These courses would assist staff and
16 particularly community members with a better
17 understanding of the many environmental regulations
18 which impact on our site in particular.

19 My plan is to sometime between now
20 and the next community meeting, to send out some
21 sort of a more definitive mailer on this offering,
22 proposed offering next summer, and to get your
23 input on when, you know, what would be the best
24 evenings and the best hours and so forth, and we'll

1 gather all that input and probably the same way we
2 did on the environmental interest project, not only
3 will we take your mail back but at the community
4 meeting, for sure the next one and maybe even the
5 next two if we get them in before next summer, I'm
6 not sure what our plans are, we'll give two
7 opportunities to actually fill out your required,
8 not required, your preferred times let's say to
9 offer the course. You'll hear more about that
10 later.

11 I always like to brag about our
12 recycling program. It's one of the things I can
13 take credit for starting here at the site, and then
14 when someone reminded me, I believe it's true, that
15 the RCRA law actually requires that you have a
16 recycling program, I was awfully glad that we
17 started one and have a real good recycling program
18 underway. Needless to say, we are dedicated to
19 recycling. Not only does it conserve natural
20 resources, but we are finding it's resulting in
21 great cost savings. It seems like in many
22 instances the real savings are cost avoidance
23 savings. To recycle is a whole lot better than
24 paying to have it disposed of at some landfill.

1 Since February, '91, we have recycled
2 over 57,000 pounds of white office paper.
3 Everybody has by their desk a little box that you
4 can put in your white paper scraps. Since August
5 of '91, we have recycled over 120 laser jet printer
6 cartridges. In addition, we have bought a great
7 many recycled jet printer cartridges, and to date
8 this effort, and this is just since August of '91,
9 we have realized a cost savings of \$18,000.

10 All DOE stationery on-site is now
11 made from recycled paper. Likewise, I think Leo
12 Duffy pointed that out here recently, his five-year
13 plan was also printed on recycled paper. As part
14 of our Community Outreach Program in the last year,
15 that is from last November through this month, we
16 have donated almost 3,000 pounds of aluminum cans
17 to the Crosby Elementary School. I know the price
18 of aluminum varies, but I think it's somewhere
19 between 30 and 50 cents per pound. That's quite a
20 sum of money that's been realized by Crosby
21 Elementary School. It's so simple to throw the can
22 in a box rather than in the trash can. When it
23 amounts to that much money, I think it goes to a
24 good cause.

1 We are also working on two other
2 recycling projects which could result in
3 substantial savings. That's cardboard recycling
4 and recycling of wooden pallets. We are very, very
5 seriously looking into just how can we recycle
6 wooden pallets or even convert to metal pallets. I
7 understand they cost about a hundred dollars per
8 wooden pallet to buy and about \$1,100 to dispose of
9 when they get broken up or contaminated or what
10 have you. I think the idea of finding a way to
11 recycle wooden pallets or even replace them with
12 metal has tremendous opportunity.

13 ERMC. I think I commented a little
14 bit on ERMC, Environmental Restoration Management
15 Contract. As you know, we are in the middle of a
16 process to convert to, the first DOE site to
17 convert to this new contractual arrangement for
18 managing the cleanup at Fernald.

19 I think at our last community meeting
20 I mentioned that the draft request for proposals
21 was about to go out. Well, it did in fact go out
22 for comment, essentially out on the street the
23 whole month of August. Many comments have been
24 received from individual citizens, contractors,

1 what have you, and we, DOE, have been and are
2 reviewing all of those comments to see what their
3 relative merits are with regard to making suggested
4 modifications to the request, the actual request
5 for proposal which we put out on the street. About
6 all I can say at this point is that plans are to
7 issue this request for proposal sometime during the
8 next 60 days. We are all anxiously, just as many
9 of you are anxiously waiting for it to be released,
10 and to begin on the process. Our current schedule
11 has us implementing this concept sometime towards
12 the latter part of next summer.

13 The last thing I thought perhaps I
14 should mention, we have just had a Tiger, DOE Tiger
15 Team visit our site. I'm sure many of you have
16 read through the past couple of years about Tiger
17 Teams as they not only visited Fernald but various
18 DOE facilities around the country. I believe some
19 26 DOE facilities have now had the initial Tiger
20 team visits. Fernald was I think the third site to
21 have a Tiger Team visit, and that was back in July,
22 August of '89.

23 The team that just visited us between
24 the 15th and 25th of this month was the first DOE

1 Tiger Team re-evaluation or revisit by a Tiger
2 Team, a much smaller Tiger Team. I think the last
3 time they had 35 people on. This time we had 11
4 folks from either DOE headquarters or contractors
5 supporting the DOE headquarters, and they spent,
6 instead of six or seven weeks, they spent ten or
7 eleven days with us. We have a draft report from
8 them, and we are now reviewing that draft report.
9 Sometime perhaps in the future, I don't know when,
10 that document will be finalized and I would imagine
11 put in the mailing room. I have no idea when that
12 might take place. As I said, we have the draft
13 report now, we're reviewing that, and so forth.

14 I think that covers the six items
15 that I would like to cover tonight, and I'll turn
16 it back over to Teresa. Thank you.

17 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Next we'll have
18 Jack Craig, who will give us the bulk of the
19 presentation on cleanup tonight.

20 MR. CRAIG: Thanks, Teresa. Once
21 again, I would like to thank you for your
22 attendance here tonight. I have quite a bit of
23 information to go through. If for some reason you
24 can't hear me in the back, just yell and I will

1 speak up a little bit.

2 Topics I would like to cover tonight,
3 first of all, short discussion on the Amended
4 Consent Agreement, followed by RI/FS update, and
5 then an update on the removal actions at the site.

6 Concerning the Consent Agreement, I
7 think I spoke at the January meeting about some
8 ongoing negotiations that were taking place between
9 DOE and US EPA and Ohio EPA. Negotiations were a
10 result of a settlement agreement which DOE and US
11 EPA signed in May of this year, and that agreement
12 stipulated a four-month period for renegotiation of
13 a 1990 Consent Agreement. I'm happy to report that
14 the agreement was signed by DOE and EPA on
15 September 20th of this year, the revised
16 agreement.

17 This agreement contained revised
18 language both in the format of the agreement and I
19 guess mostly the RI/FS schedules were revised, and
20 I think on your chairs tonight there's a copy of a
21 diagram, which really outlines the new milestones
22 for the five operable units of the site. I think
23 the copy you have on your chair has a legend on it
24 to help you, to help explain some of the acronyms

1 that are shown on the slide.

2 The five bars here represent the five
3 operable units of the site, Operable Units 1
4 through 5, and as you can see, the milestones, the
5 RI being Remedial Investigation report, the FS/PP
6 is the Feasibility Study and Proposed Plan, and the
7 ROD would be the Record of Decision.

8 Now, for you who aren't familiar with
9 these acronyms, Remedial Investigation report
10 really documents the present situation of the
11 operable unit, being to characterize the nature and
12 extent of any contamination in that area. The
13 Feasibility Study and Proposed Plan, through the
14 Feasibility Study we will evaluate different
15 alternatives for cleanup and through the Proposed
16 Plan, one of those alternatives will be put forward
17 as the selected alternative, and that's the
18 alternative that will go out for public comment,
19 official public comment. The Record of Decision is
20 the mechanism by which the selected remedy for that
21 operable unit is documented.

22 As you can see on the slide, the
23 first Record of Decision is now Operable Unit 2,
24 which is December of 1993. I think prior to -- as

1 a result of this negotiation, the prior 1990
2 agreement had Operable Unit 4 as the first. So
3 there have been some changes. Operable Unit 4 is
4 the second Record of Decision, which as you can see
5 is June of '94; OU-1 is the next one, December of
6 '94; OU-5 will follow that in August, '95; and
7 OU-3 is the final Record of Decision for the
8 operable units, being May of '97.

9 I also want to recognize tonight
10 there was significant effort both within DOE,
11 Westinghouse, and ASI/IT team in the preparation of
12 all the material that went into coming up with
13 these dates. There are very detailed schedules,
14 resource loaded schedules put together, which
15 resulted in these new milestones. I think it
16 really helped our negotiations to have that
17 material available.

18 Also included in the new agreements
19 are some additional removal actions. As shown
20 here, Phase 1 removal actions were removal actions
21 that were either ongoing at the time negotiations
22 were taking place or were part of the 1990 Consent
23 Agreement. I'll speak about these a little bit
24 later.

1 Included in the modified or revised
2 agreements are new removal actions. I've listed
3 them here, I think they're on the chairs also.
4 They would be removal actions number 8 through 18.
5 I'll briefly go through these. The dates as shown
6 are dates for submittal of work plans, which will
7 include a schedule for completion of the activities
8 on removal action.

9 Number 8, inactive flyash pile
10 control, there will be activities to place some
11 restrictions on the inactive flyash pile which has
12 been covered between dirt and essentially is to
13 restrict access essentially for worker health and
14 safety to the area. It will include construction
15 of barriers and ties to restrict access to the
16 area.

17 Number 9 included in the removal of
18 waste inventories. This is essentially our ongoing
19 waste shipment program. What we do, we try to
20 integrate that as a removal action in this new
21 agreement. We do have an ongoing waste shipment
22 program, which we have submitted procedures to US
23 and Ohio EPA for approval, and this is now removal
24 action number 9.

1 Active flyash pile controls, this was
2 I think an issue at the last meeting about it might
3 have helped with the way control emissions, both
4 runoff, potential runoff, and wind erosion from the
5 active flyash pile, and this removal action will
6 address that by creation of both wind and water
7 erosion barriers.

8 Number 11, the Pit 5 experimental
9 treatment facility, this action deals with a
10 treatment facility that was built for some of the
11 Pit 5 material. The facility was built in the
12 early '80's. It's very deteriorated. It was
13 built, first of all, for, as a treatment or
14 experimental treatment facility. It was
15 essentially a greenhouse. What they were trying to
16 do was take the Pit 5 sludges, put in a greenhouse
17 and dry them out and reduce all of that waste, and
18 through the years that facility has become very
19 deteriorated and it's going to be somehow either
20 removed, decontaminated and boxed, box the
21 material.

22 Safe shutdown, removal action number
23 12, includes the activities which are planned
24 on-site to shut down the production facilities and

1 equipment which will no longer be in use at the
2 facility. This will include removal of any
3 materials in the process lines and the locking and
4 tagging of equipment in facilities that will no
5 longer be used.

6 Number 13, the Plant 1 ore silos, I
7 spoke of this at the last meeting, this includes
8 the decontaminating, decommissioning and
9 dismantling of four silos near Plant 1. Design is
10 underway for this schedule in the middle of January
11 of 1992.

12 Removal action number 14 includes
13 addressing some potentially contaminated soils near
14 an inactive incinerator. This removal action will
15 look at the further characterization of that area
16 and removal of any soils based on that
17 investigation.

18 Number 15, the scrap metal piles. If
19 you look at some of the photos which are in the
20 back, there are pictures of a large amount of scrap
21 metal on-site, which has accumulated over the
22 years, and this removal action will address either
23 the removal or the containment of all the scrap
24 metal on-site.

1 Number 16, another action to control
2 runoff from the site. This is an area, the
3 northeast of the production area near the scrap
4 metal piles which we will take some action to
5 control runoff collected in that area.

6 Number 17, improved storage of soil
7 and debris, this includes all the construction
8 rubble and soils on-site which are potentially
9 contaminated. This will include some type of
10 measures to cover that material or dispose of it
11 off-site.

12 Number 18, control of exposed
13 material in Pit 5. This action will be similar to
14 the action, potentially could be similar to the
15 action we took in Pit 6. What this mainly is going
16 to address is any potential emissions from the
17 exposed material in Pit 5.

18 Any other modification or changes in
19 the new agreement, we have agreed on an annual
20 basis the Department of Energy will look at
21 additional removal actions to be undertaken at the
22 site and submit those to US and Ohio EPA in January
23 of each year, and this will be an ongoing annual
24 review which will be done to look at additional

1 removals.

2 The other I guess major change has to
3 do with what's called comprehensive site-wide risk
4 assessment. We identified early on in our
5 negotiations that there was a rather significant
6 issue on how we would address risk, site-wide risk,
7 while we were looking at each operable unit on an
8 individual basis, and what we wanted to make sure
9 of by looking at each operable unit on an
10 individual basis, we did not lose sight of how we
11 would address risk on a site-wide basis. What
12 we've agreed to do, there's language in the new
13 agreement to address this, but we will look at each
14 operable unit individually, also considering
15 leading candidate alternatives from other operable
16 units while we're making the decisions on the
17 individual use. So if we were evaluating an
18 individual operable unit, we would also be
19 considering alternatives from other operable units,
20 so we wouldn't just be making decisions on that
21 operable unit without considering site-wide
22 impacts.

23 I guess we're going to be doing that
24 through the Feasibility Study process of each OU,

1 but a major change would be at the, following the
2 issuance of the final Record of Decision, which in
3 this case is Operable Unit 3, we would also be
4 doing another look, which we'll call a
5 comprehensive site-wide risk assessment, which is
6 going to take each Record of Decision, look at the
7 risk of those Records of Decision for each of the
8 five operable units, the impact and the risks on a
9 site-wide basis. If the risk from those five
10 alternatives is within the risks granted to us that
11 the EPA has set, then no further action will be
12 undertaken. If it is not, then we may have to go
13 in or we will have to go in and modify one of the
14 alternatives in the individual operable unit.

15 The status on the RI/FS. I want to
16 briefly go through each operable unit, a little bit
17 of background on each one, status of field work,
18 other activities and any documents that have been
19 issued over the summer.

20 For Operable Unit 1, as you can see
21 the definition on the overhead here, one of the
22 changes in the agreement as you'll see on the
23 following operable units, anything that is
24 underlined up here is a change in the definition of

1 the operable unit, and what we did, we added
2 language to the definition of each operable unit to
3 clarify the definition and the scope of the
4 operable unit so we can avoid any miscommunication
5 or conflicts in the future about what was included
6 in a specific operable unit scope.

7 As far as field works goes, Operable
8 Unit 1 has completed all of its RI/FS field work.
9 It was completed in early October of this year.
10 The analysis from those samples of Operable Unit 1
11 are due back in January of 1992, and that
12 information will be fed into the Remedial
13 Investigation report for that operable unit.

14 Treatability Studies, these are the
15 studies that are going to be undertaken on the
16 specific waste from that operable unit, Operable
17 Unit 1. The Treatability Studies will be
18 undertaken to determine the best way to treat the
19 waste, and that information is factored into the
20 Feasibility Study process. The Treatability
21 Studies for OU-1 will be started in November of
22 this year, and that treatability work plan is at
23 EPA for approval right now.

24 Operable Unit 2, as you can see,

1 there's a further clarification of the definition
2 and scope of this operable unit as well as Operable
3 Unit 1. The status of the field work, once again
4 all the RI/FS sampling activities for OU-2 have
5 been completed, they were also completed in October
6 of this year. Analysis is due back on these
7 samples from the laboratory in December of this
8 year. Treatability Studies have started for
9 Operable Unit 2, they started in September of this
10 year and are scheduled for completion in March of
11 '92. That information will also go into the
12 Feasibility Study for OU-2.

13 Operable Unit 3, as you can see,
14 there was a significant clarification of the scope
15 of this operable unit. I think if you'll look at
16 the schedule that was put up there earlier, you can
17 see that this is far and away the operable unit
18 which has the longest duration until the Record of
19 Decision, and really the basis for that is that we
20 have agreed and through the settlement and through
21 our negotiations to include all the facilities in
22 this site, all the waste material, all the drum
23 material, any product on-site in Operable Unit 3,
24 and this is a significant effort to do further

1 characterization of production area. And that was
2 all factored into the schedule to come up with the
3 revised milestones for OU-3.

4 As far as documents go, I wanted to
5 mention there was -- I think we talked a little bit
6 at the last meeting about an historic photo survey
7 that was done at the site undertaken really looking
8 at what was thought to be a suspected buried vault
9 north of the production area. That historic photo
10 survey is available at the Administrative Record.
11 That along with questions and discussions with
12 former workers went into DOE basically coming up
13 with the resolution of that suspected vault. It's
14 DOE's opinion that the vault was really Plant 6.
15 If you look at the historic photos, Plant 6 when it
16 was constructed has a very large basement to it and
17 a very large foundation to it. If you look at the
18 aerial photos, it looks very similar to a vault,
19 and based on the historic photos, based on
20 interviews, that was our conclusion, and that
21 information is available also in the Administrative
22 Record.

23 Operable Unit 4, once again further
24 clarification of the definition. Very significant

1 activity was completed since the last public
2 meeting, and that had to do with the sampling
3 activities for the K-65 silos. This included
4 sampling of the silos' berms, the slant borings
5 that we were sampling underneath the silos, and
6 also sampling of the silo contents for residue
7 sampling. All of these activities were completed
8 in August. The information is being analyzed right
9 now. That analysis is due back on all these
10 samples in January of 1992. That information will
11 feed into the Remedial Investigation report for
12 Operable Unit 4.

13 Treatability Studies, they started
14 this month on the K-65 samples, and the berm and
15 boring samples initiated in October.

16 For Operable Unit 5, once again a
17 clarification of the definition. One of the things
18 that I guess significantly changed between the OUs,
19 Operable Unit 3 and Operable Unit 5 kind of changed
20 focus, I guess would be the best way to
21 characterize it. Perched groundwater in the old
22 agreement was in Operable Unit 3; it is now in
23 Operable Unit 5, and all soils that are not
24 included in the definition of the other OUs are now

1 in Operable Unit 5.

2 Status of field work, I mentioned the
3 last meeting an ongoing Paddy's Run seepage study,
4 which is a study of the, a study of Paddy's Run
5 south of New Haven Road to determine any influence
6 that Paddy's Run may have on the aquifer, any
7 potential contamination which may have been carried
8 by Paddy's Run south of the South Plume and into
9 the aquifer. That study is ongoing. It's about a
10 year long process.

11 Now, on removal actions, I spoke a
12 little bit about this at the last meeting. I think
13 there has been significant progress made. I'll go
14 through each one. First of all, the perched
15 groundwater. I think there was -- at the last
16 meeting we identified that the perched groundwater
17 for Plant 6 was operating. The total project
18 included Plant 6, Plant 9, Plant 2-3, and Plant 8,
19 and included pumping contaminated water from those
20 facilities to a treatment facility in Plant 8. And
21 the contaminant was a volatile organic compound
22 which was trichloroethane, which is a degreaser
23 that was used or a solvent that was used in the
24 plant processes over the years.

1 To date we have started pumping water
2 from all four of those facilities to Plant 8, where
3 it's being treated through proper absorption unit
4 which is shown in this picture here. This is the
5 treatment facility in Plant 8. As of the 25th of
6 October we have treated 18,000 gallons of water
7 from these facilities. The treatment ranged or the
8 water prior to treatment ranged in the
9 contamination levels from 500 to 12,000 parts per
10 billion trichloroethane. We're treating that water
11 now to 5 parts per billion, which is the
12 contaminant level set by US EPA, maximum
13 contaminant level.

14 The South Plume, we met with US and
15 Ohio EPA today. We have experienced a few
16 difficulties in this removal action. I think as I
17 spoke of at the last meeting, this removal action
18 is divided into five phases. Phase 1 being the
19 provision of an alternate water supply to the two
20 facilities south of the site. Some of the delays
21 we've experienced in that removal action include
22 some problems we've had with gaining access to some
23 of the private properties to construct a water line
24 in that area. That has generated or I guess it has

1 given that project about a four-month schedule
2 extension. We talked to EPA about it today. Some
3 of the other things we're waiting on, we have built
4 a new well to provide this water to these two
5 facilities and we are now awaiting a water quality
6 analysis to come back on that water to determine
7 its viability for a new water supply.

8 Phase number 2 included extraction
9 wells to the South Plume water itself. We have ran
10 into some problems here with the location of these
11 extraction wells. Early on, I believe late last
12 spring or early summer, we had got some analysis of
13 the Paddy's Run Road site investigation and
14 determined that the location which we had proposed
15 to put the extraction wells would also influence or
16 possibly extract some of the contamination from the
17 Paddy's Run Road site, so we've had a lot of
18 discussion with US and Ohio EPA. I think we've
19 resolved the problem by moving the extraction wells
20 north of their facility, but we did experience some
21 delays because of the Paddy's Run Road site
22 influence on the design of that extraction system.

23 Phase number 3 included treatment of
24 a water stream on-site to insure that we are not

1 increasing the uranium loading to the Great Miami
2 River by pumping water back to the site. We have
3 agreed to increase the uranium removal or the
4 treatment of that facility from 150 gallons per
5 minute to 300 gallons per minute, and we agreed to
6 do that because the new location of the extraction
7 wells will increase the amount of uranium we're
8 going to be pumping back to the site. So we have
9 agreed to treat more water to insure that we are
10 not increasing uranium loading to the river.

11 Part 3 included monitoring and
12 institutional controls, and that really looks at
13 insuring that no private property is using water
14 that's contaminated in the South Plume, putting
15 deep restrictions and so forth to insure that water
16 is not used.

17 Part 5 really went with our, the
18 issues that were brought up in part 2 and part 3.
19 Since we found contamination from the Paddy's Run
20 Road site in the area which we had originally
21 planned to put extraction wells, we have agreed to
22 go ahead and do further studies in this area to
23 determine the exact or as exact as we can location
24 of the Paddy's Run Road site and how it influences

1 with the South Plume. This will include some
2 further monitoring and further well installations
3 in that area.

4 K-65 silos. This removal action
5 includes the addition of bentonite clay to the K-65
6 silos to reduce radon emissions. This removal
7 action is on schedule for completion on December
8 1st of this year. You pictorially see shown really
9 just part of that removal action. What we have
10 agreed to do as part of the work plan was to go in
11 with a mechanical structure like source and map the
12 inside of the silos to get a picture of the contour
13 of the material prior to bentonite installation,
14 and then we will go back in following the bentonite
15 installation to insure that we've covered all
16 material and insure there's a one-foot layer across
17 the entire surface of the material.

18 Waste pit area runoff control. This
19 removal action includes the collection of
20 stormwater runoff in the waste pit area. This
21 removal action was initiated this spring. A
22 picture of the ongoing trenching operations is
23 shown here. The removal action is approximately 40
24 percent complete and is on schedule for completion

1 in July of next year, July 30th.

2 The Plant 1 pad renovation, this is a
3 removal action that was identified prior to our
4 negotiations but was not in the 1990 Consent
5 Agreement. This removal action addresses upgrading
6 the existing Plant 1 pad low level waste, drum
7 waste storage today. It includes increased runoff
8 controls and also some covered storage for the
9 drums in the area to get them out of the weather.
10 What's shown here are some covered structures. You
11 can see one, the blue covered structure and one
12 going up right beside it showing, the framing is
13 shown, but these are two structures which were put
14 up or being put up while this construction is going
15 on. These are two 26,000 square feet enclosures,
16 and they will provide covered storage for 28,000
17 drums of material.

18 Removal of waste inventory. I spoke
19 a little bit about our ongoing waste shipment
20 program. This has now been incorporated as a
21 removal action on the Consent Agreement. I think
22 Ray Hansen spoke about our waste shipment program
23 at the last meeting. What's shown here is really
24 the cumulative waste disposal from 1986 through

1 September 30th of 1991, really showing the amount
2 of drum equivalents of waste that have been shipped
3 off-site in the last five years.

4 The next slide shows our waste
5 shipment goal, original goal, revised goal, and
6 the -- I should say actual shipment of waste that
7 occurred in fiscal year 1991, which concluded
8 September 30th of this year, and as you can see, we
9 exceeded the original goal, the revised goal, and
10 through significant effort exceeded it by about
11 5,500 drum equivalents. I will add during FY-92,
12 there will be a significant increase to these
13 numbers both in the goal and in the actual.

14 Inactive flyash pile control, I spoke
15 about this a little bit earlier. It's being
16 undertaken to restrict access to the inactive
17 flyash pile which has been covered with clean
18 dirt. This removal action includes the erection of
19 warning signs and the installation of a barrier,
20 which we talked about with US EPA today, which is a
21 chain which will be put up which will clearly
22 identify the boundaries of the inactive flyash
23 pile. This flyash pile is within the site
24 boundaries, so it does have a fence, if you will,

1 around it. This will further clarify the
2 boundaries within the site.

3 Finally, on the removal actions, the
4 uranyl nitrate emergency removal action, I think
5 this was brought up at the EPA meeting held earlier
6 this month. The purpose of this is to prevent the
7 potential release of any material from these
8 tanks. About a month ago some leaks were detected
9 in some of the piping near one of the tanks, UN
10 tanks which are located near or south of Plant 1.
11 This removal action is being undertaken to prevent
12 any possible further leakage from those tanks.
13 Although we have addressed the original leak by
14 patching, the drums of the tanks and associated
15 piping with those tanks are very old and
16 deteriorated, so we have decided to undertake an
17 emergency removal action to remove the material and
18 process it to a safer state. Approximately 200,000
19 gallons are stored in the tanks. That material
20 will be processed beginning in November, following
21 some detailed safety reviews and operational
22 readiness reviews to ensure the operation is done
23 safely.

24 Pictured here are the actual tanks

1 from which the leaks were detected. The Plant 1
2 ore silos are shown behind that, they are both
3 south of Plant 1.

4 The last slide really is just a
5 schematic of the activities that are going to be
6 taking place to stabilize the material. Briefly,
7 the tanks will be -- the material will be sent to a
8 boil down tank where the uranyl nitrate will be
9 mixed to a constant or a steady concentration for
10 it to go through the precipitation process. At the
11 precipitation tank we will add magnesium hydroxide
12 to raise the pH of the uranyl nitrate to aid in the
13 precipitation of the uranium in the material. That
14 will go through filters. The filters will separate
15 the material into solid or liquid. The filtered
16 cake or residue will be drummed and stored on-site.
17 The filtrate or liquid will be processed through
18 the existing treatment facilities at the plant.

19 That's all I have. Once again,
20 thanks. I'll be available during the break or
21 later on to answer your questions.

22 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Thank you, Jack.
23 As you can see, Jack is a walking environmental
24 encyclopedia on the site.

1 Before we take a quick break, I would
2 like Jerry Westerbeck to recognize all the
3 wonderful people that worked and dedicated
4 themselves to the Amended Consent Agreement.

5 MR. WESTERBECK: I think it's only
6 appropriate, Jack alluded to it and I know some of
7 you can probably see from the discussion we had
8 about the renegotiations, the details, that are now
9 laid out in the Amended Consent Agreement. If you
10 would, I would like especially to recognize some of
11 these folks who gave up just about every week, two
12 or three days of every week from May 13th through
13 about the middle of August, either in Chicago or
14 here, so if it's held in Chicago, folks from here
15 had to travel up there and vice versa.

16 Jim Saric, would you please stand, I
17 want everybody to see who we're talking about. Jim
18 Saric from US EPA, Region 5. Graham Mitchell, Ohio
19 EPA. John Razor and John Wood from ASI/IT. Hugh
20 Daugherty and Dennis Carr from Westinghouse. And,
21 of course, Jack Craig from DOE, and in abstention,
22 Dave Kozlowski. He has attended one or two
23 meetings in the past. These people actually did --
24 and Beth Oshiem, our lawyer, of course. Beth,

1 where are you?

2 As I said, they did a tremendous
3 job. They left no detail unturned or unstudied.
4 That has produced the schedules and work
5 descriptions that I think all of us have a
6 tremendous amount of confidence in. We know what
7 the work is, we know what the resources are
8 required to meet, to do the work and to meet the
9 schedules, and we're awful doggone confident that
10 we can do it in the time frames that we have
11 mutually agreed upon. All the work that was done
12 has been definitely recognized, I can at least
13 speak for our side, the DOE side, right up to Leo
14 Duffy. I think he is wanting to use that as a
15 model for negotiating similar type agreements
16 around the DOE complex. Our hats are off to you
17 people and we really thank you for all the extra,
18 extra hours and effort involved in this. Thank
19 you.

20 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Okay. Now we're
21 all looking forward to our break. If we can break
22 for ten minutes until about 8:15. Thanks.

23 (Brief recess.)

24 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: We're now moving

1 into our public forum segment, and first off we
2 would like to invite the US EPA to come up and give
3 us their comments this evening. I believe Jim
4 Saric is with us tonight.

5 MR. SARIC: I'd like to start out by
6 reminding everyone that as of our meeting we had
7 two weeks ago, US EPA had regarding the Amended
8 Consent Agreement on October 31st at the end of our
9 public comment period, so those of you who would
10 like to make comments, we do have some extra sheets
11 in the back of the room to write down your comments
12 and give it to us tonight, that would be great.
13 Otherwise, if you would please postmark it by the
14 31st so it gets in the mail on Halloween, and
15 whenever it gets to us after that, that's fine, as
16 long as it's postmarked by the 31st, that would be
17 great.

18 I'll be available for any questions
19 anyone has, I'll stay after our meeting. If you
20 want to talk to me about anything, I would be more
21 than happy to answer any questions you have.

22 We met today with the Project Manager
23 from DOE and went over almost all the things we did
24 today in a lot more detail, believe me. I think

1 there's one big thing that is pretty important I
2 think and pretty significant is the K-65 silos. In
3 the middle of November they're going to start
4 installation of bentonite in the K-65 silos. I
5 think that's a very positive thing that's going on
6 to mitigate the release of radon emitted from the
7 silos. That's a very positive sign I think that
8 we're getting to that, we're finally underway with
9 this project and we'll move on from there. There's
10 other issues, the other removal actions are
11 ongoing. We've got concerns with the South Plume,
12 we are working with DOE and everyone to try to get
13 this thing resolved and get the project back on
14 track.

15 That's about all I've got. Again, if
16 you have any questions, see me afterwards. Thank
17 you.

18 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Next we have
19 Graham Mitchell from the Ohio EPA to provide us
20 with his comments.

21 MR. MITCHELL: Good evening. I'd
22 like to apologize for missing the last two
23 meetings, I hope that doesn't happen again.

24 As I said before, it's Ohio EPA's

1 goals to see that the site is cleaned up and
2 cleaned up properly. As it has been mentioned
3 tonight, we have a new cleanup schedule that Ohio
4 EPA participated in the negotiations. We're fairly
5 pleased with the outcome of that, especially with
6 the new removal actions and the process for
7 identifying additional removal actions as time goes
8 on.

9 Ohio EPA and Governor Voinovich's
10 office are also very much in support of the DOE
11 supplying a public water supply to the people
12 around Fernald. We feel that this is a really
13 major important step for DOE to get involved with,
14 and we are standing by to assist in any way.

15 One concern I have, about the only
16 concern I have right now, concerns the ERMC
17 contract, and DOE is preparing a request for
18 proposal for the environmental restoration
19 management contract for the Fernald site. Ohio EPA
20 is concerned about any possible schedule delays
21 that could occur during a transition period of this
22 contract. We are in support of the ERMC concept,
23 we think it's a good idea, but we're also very
24 concerned that in a transition period historical

1 knowledge could be lost and schedules that we've
2 just spent so much time negotiating could be
3 postponed. So we feel that DOE has the obligation
4 to insure that this does not occur.

5 As always, we're here tonight to
6 answer your questions. With me tonight are Tom
7 Schneider and Andrea Futrell, both with Ohio EPA,
8 and we'll be glad to answer any questions you might
9 have tonight. Thank you.

10 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Thanks, Graham.
11 Now we have FRESH to offer us their comments.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: I'm not coming up
13 there.

14 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: That's okay.

15 MS. CRAWFORD: I'm standing back
16 here. Mine aren't as short as everybody else's.

17 The first thing I want to talk about
18 is the new DOE Site Manager, which I had the
19 pleasure of meeting at 6:00 this evening because
20 our schedules were very conflicting, and we weren't
21 able to get together before tonight. I think one
22 of the things we want to do, Mr. Tiller, is we want
23 to extend you a hearty welcome and, you know, as
24 the new DOE Site Manager. We also want to thank

1 Jerry Westerbeck for his role as the former
2 manager, and we certainly hope, it's one of our
3 greatest hopes, that Mr. Tiller will follow Mr.
4 Westerbeck with an open door policy as we found to
5 have here lately, and in kind of the same way Jerry
6 has worked with us. We also hope that the sharing
7 of information continues, and, after all, the
8 communicating with FRESH and with the neighbors
9 makes everyone's life a whole lot easier and it
10 keeps the cleanup issues upfront and fresh in
11 everybody's mind.

12 We also want to thank Teressa tonight
13 for allowing us to set up our table, which we
14 didn't think we would be allowed to do, but we were
15 and that's great.

16 The second thing I want to talk about
17 is the Consent Agreement. The new Consent
18 Agreement has been renegotiated and signed. Even
19 though the deadlines seem a little bit endless to
20 us, FRESH feels it is now time to move forward and
21 meet these deadlines head on. It is imperative for
22 this Consent Agreement to work because this is the
23 third one. We don't want any more delays. We hope
24 no more delays are expected nor should they be

1 expected. FRESH expects efficiency and value for
2 our taxpayers' money.

3 I want to make it real clear again
4 that with the signing of new Consent Agreement we
5 are definitely going to be looking over people's
6 shoulders probably a little harder than we even did
7 in the last seven years, not only DOE but also
8 subcontractors' and prime contractors' shoulders,
9 and again I want to reiterate that the cleanup
10 needs to be done efficiently and effectively for
11 all of us, especially for our kids, it's real
12 important that we get the site cleaned up for our
13 children. And we don't want any more delays, we
14 don't expect any more delays, we won't tolerate any
15 more delays. This is it, this is the last chance
16 to prove yourselves. A safe, diligent cleanup
17 needs to start now and finish when the job is done
18 and done correctly. Again, it's just a warning to
19 remember that the eyes of FRESH are going to be
20 watching you and very closely watching you and
21 documenting heavily now that we have this new
22 agreement.

23 The next item I have, it's our
24 understanding that there has been five teams on the

1 site, and Teressa keeps me very up-to-date with
2 whose there and how many people and when they're
3 coming and going and all of that. I heard a
4 comment earlier tonight that the Tiger Team has
5 given a draft report and there's a PR Ice Team, the
6 OMB Corps of Engineers, Ice Team, Tiger Team
7 Re-evaluation Team, the Inspector General Computer
8 Base Systems Inspector, and the GAO Asbestos
9 Removal Team. I want to make sure that as these
10 reports are finished and brought out that we are
11 provided with copies of them when they're
12 available.

13 The next thing is, number four is
14 status of unusual incidents. They talked about the
15 flyash pit a little earlier, that they are still
16 misting it, and I did talk to somebody in the back
17 about that. There was an issue earlier a few
18 months ago with a noncompliance with nickel at the
19 general sump. There's no mention of that tonight.
20 Has that been corrected?

21 MR. CRAIG: There have been no
22 further noncompliances.

23 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay, I just want to
24 make sure I keep my documentation up-to-date. The

1 criticality alarm in Plant 8 that was
2 nonfunctional, I'm assuming that was repaired and
3 it is now functional. The air handling unit in
4 Building 12, everything is back to normal,
5 everything is fine. And then you talked about the
6 uranyl nitrate, and then -- that one is minor.

7 One of the -- this is a really hard
8 subject for me to have to bring up tonight, but I
9 feel real adamant that it does need to be brought
10 up and I want to echo Graham Mitchell's concerns
11 about the RFP and the contracts and possibly having
12 delays in those. Several companies are showing a
13 great desire to clean up the Fernald facility. Two
14 now have offices in Ross and one has an office in
15 Blue Ash. People who live in the community and
16 members of FRESH are becoming increasingly upset
17 over the pushiness of these companies. Promises
18 are being made and the community's money is being
19 thrown around, and big, and I mean big public
20 relations campaigns are being launched. Several of
21 the workers inside of the plant have told me
22 personally that one certain company even had the
23 audacity to send flyers inside the plant making it
24 look like they already had the contract. Quite

1 frankly, this really scares us. One company
2 representative told me that they had the best
3 community relations plan anywhere in the country.

4 Our understanding is that all public
5 relations and community relations has to go through
6 the DOE site office, through Teressa. That's my
7 understanding and my group's understanding of how
8 the public relations stuff works at the site. And
9 it would not go through subcontractors' offices. I
10 think a really good clear message needs to be sent
11 to these companies, place your bids, wait for the
12 selection process, and then we'll discuss our
13 options and our opinions. Not until then. Keep
14 your promises to yourself and quit trying to buy
15 off the communities. Most importantly, get those
16 huge, and I mean big green dollar signs out of your
17 eyes.

18 FRESH will settle for nothing less
19 than the best cleanup possible. We will not
20 tolerate, and I won't use this cuss word, we won't
21 tolerate a half blank job here. Take this as your
22 official notice. We will only settle for the
23 best. That's my words to the companies out there
24 buying off these communities. I think it's wrong.

1 Another issue that I feel is real
2 important that needs to be brought up this evening,
3 I've had several workers, and I have a lot of
4 contact with workers, I've had several workers call
5 me and say to me that some new people are going to
6 be hired at the site, rank and file workers. The
7 last number I got was like 50, and that some of
8 these guys have been laid off back in '89 and their
9 two years are up and their names aren't on the rags
10 down at the unemployment office, and they've got
11 some years' service. Some of them have actually
12 sent me copies of their evaluation reports and
13 recommendations from upper level management at the
14 site. These guys want the opportunity to come back
15 to work there. If they worked there previously and
16 they have the experience under their belt, I would
17 much rather see them hired rather than just going
18 to the unemployment office and picking 50 names out
19 of the hopper and saying here's 50 new employees
20 for you. I would prefer that these workers who
21 were laid off be given the opportunity to come back
22 and add some more years on to their seniority
23 levels. I think that's real important. There's a
24 lot of training going on out there that they could

1 be participating in if they already have a good
2 knowledge of what's on the site if they worked
3 there any amount of time. Several of them told me
4 they worked there seven, eight, nine, ten years. I
5 think that's the least we can do for them, is offer
6 them the opportunity to come back and work some
7 more if they so choose to do so.

8 In August -- this is another issue --
9 in August there was an article in one of the local
10 papers about thorium being shipped to the Nevada
11 test site. I happened to be in Nevada,
12 unfortunately, a few months ago. And toured the
13 Nevada test site and had the opportunity to talk to
14 several people who considered themselves to be
15 pretty high level DOE folks out there, I don't know
16 whether they were or not, but we talked to them.
17 And the one guy I talked to, I said, I understand
18 our thorium is going to be coming here, I don't
19 know exactly when but they tell us pretty soon, and
20 he looked at me with astonished eyes and said,
21 "We're not taking Fernald's thorium. Nobody said
22 we were and we're not going to take it." And I was
23 like stonefaced because I didn't know what to say
24 to him. It kind of shocked me because it was in

1 the paper and we had been told that it possibly
2 would go to the Nevada test site.

3 So my concern here is don't make
4 promises to us that you don't know a hundred
5 percent for sure that you're going to be able to do
6 or not because it makes us have really negative
7 feelings when you tell us you're going to do
8 something and then you can't follow through and do
9 it. It sends a real negative message to the
10 community.

11 At the last RI/FS meeting I had this
12 huge rumor list, and it's not very long tonight,
13 it's actually very small. Several rumors have been
14 floating around the community that Westinghouse has
15 been asked not to rebid on this contract, and I
16 find that astonishing, and I would like somebody to
17 address that for me. I think how we addressed the
18 last rumor list would be perfect, Teresa.

19 We were told that an area hospital,
20 and I won't name the hospital, wants a contract to
21 do laundry each day with pickup and delivery, and I
22 have a real problem with a hospital doing that. I
23 think laundry services should be kept on the site
24 because of the possibility of moving contamination

1 around, especially in a hospital.

2 It was reported to us that the
3 cafeteria is very dirty and very unclean conditions
4 and that they are always spraying for bugs. I
5 understand that any type of food service area has
6 rodent problems every once in a while, but I think
7 the guys and the women who work there deserve to
8 eat in a clean cafeteria. They work in a pretty
9 dirty place, and the least they can do is have a
10 clean place to eat their lunch in.

11 The very last thing I want to clear
12 up tonight, there's a rumor going around that my
13 husband was a lawyer, and very frankly if my
14 husband was a lawyer, I wouldn't work, I would stay
15 at home and take care of my family. My husband is
16 not a lawyer, he's an assembly line worker for a GM
17 plant. And I think there was a misconception
18 between myself and Kathy Meyer probably because
19 it's her husband who is a lawyer and not mine.

20 That's all the comments I have. I do
21 have several questions, but I'll save those for the
22 question session. Thank you.

23 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Thank you, Lisa.
24 Now we can move on to our group question and answer

1 discussion. We did receive two comment cards
2 during the break and I think I will read those off
3 first. One question somebody asked, "Will
4 railroads be used in removal of waste?" My
5 understanding is that absolutely not, that we will
6 use trucking. Maybe that's a question that
7 possibly Ray Hansen, could you maybe address that.
8 Put Ray on the spot.

9 MR. HANSEN: Are we talking about
10 waste or products?

11 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Waste shipments.

12 MR. HANSEN: Waste shipments, our
13 intent is to continue using trucks. We are looking
14 at rail. But that's really for product more than
15 it is waste, and we're looking at it very carefully
16 because one of the concerns in shipping is that you
17 have closed, tight containers. But we are looking
18 at official waste shipping, but we have not really
19 contemplated shipping any waste by rail. Scrap
20 metals, product type things like that we're looking
21 at but not waste.

22 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Does that answer
23 the gentleman's question?

24 The second question we have I will

1 field off to the Operable Unit 5 people. How far
2 south do you expect the South Plume to progress
3 before remediation efforts decontaminate all the
4 groundwater media downgrade from the FEMP? That's
5 the first part of the question. The second part is
6 has the monitoring well revealed other sources of
7 groundwater contamination that have no connection
8 with the nuclear arsenal plant?

9 Carlos or Dave or Robin.

10 MR. FERMAINTT: I'll address the
11 first question. As described in the EE/CA back in
12 November of 1990, the South Plume is moving
13 approximately 200 feet per year. The proposed new
14 operation date for the South Plume construction
15 wells is December, 1992. So you will have pretty
16 much an idea of how long it's going to move, how
17 far south. There is a structure north as proposed
18 to be installed just south of Delta Steel facility,
19 and those will provide hydraulic barrier for the
20 higher concentration of uranium.

21 Part five is being proposed to
22 address the leading edge of the plume south of the
23 construction, and we will investigate the levels of
24 uranium below 20 parts per billion at that

1 location. We will continue monitoring that area
2 trying to delineate the location of the Paddy's Run
3 Road site plumes and see how future response action
4 could be developed.

5 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: And the second
6 part of the question.

7 MR. FERMAINTT: Could you repeat
8 that?

9 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Sure. Have
10 monitoring wells revealed others sources of
11 groundwater contamination that have no connection
12 with the nuclear arsenal plant?

13 MR. FERMAINTT: Back in the spring
14 time frame or early summer time frame information
15 from the Paddy's Run Road site investigation proved
16 that organics from those facilities were located
17 further east than what we thought. We're talking
18 about half way of the distance between Paddy's Run
19 Road and the 128 Road. We're talking more or less
20 I believe in front of the recycling, more or less
21 in front of the recycling plant. That information
22 is what triggered the investigation to relocate
23 extraction wells.

24 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Is that person

1 happy with that answer? Any more questions? I
2 guess not, thank you.

3 Our question and answer session is an
4 informal question and answer session, so I want to
5 remind you as well besides addressing the people on
6 the panel here we do have representatives from the
7 Ohio and US EPA that you can ask questions as
8 well. If I could remind you to please walk up to
9 the microphone so we can hear your question and
10 also if I can ask the audio gentlemen to activate
11 the small mikes so we don't have to hop up and down
12 when the questions are asked. The first question.
13 Yes, sir.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not
15 really familiar with Fernald, but I have a few
16 questions from being here tonight. My first
17 question deals with, you said that it's going to be
18 \$14,000,000,000, is that correct, for the total
19 amount that it's going to cost to clean it up?

20 MR. CRAIG: There have been a number
21 of estimates done. I think the latest and best
22 estimate we have right now that we're using for the
23 total cost of the cleanup is \$10,000,000,000.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ten billion,

1 okay. Who's going to pay for this? Is it going to
2 be taxes or federal?

3 MR. CRAIG: Right, it comes through
4 the Department of Energy, which is out of the
5 federal budget.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The next
7 question deals with how effective will the cleanup
8 process be, is there still going to be uranium
9 deposits anywhere, in the water table, how much of
10 this is going to be cleaned up?

11 MR. CRAIG: Part of the process, the
12 CERCLA process, has us look at all the applicable
13 regulations that we must clean up to, and that's
14 part of US EPA and Ohio EPA's involvement in this
15 is to make sure that when we go through this whole
16 process we develop alternatives, we select them so
17 that the final cleanup does meet all applicable
18 regulations. And as far as uranium goes, whatever
19 is applicable for cleanup, whether it be
20 groundwater or soil at that time, that that's what
21 it will be cleaned up to.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How long will
23 this take, the process, is there an estimate for
24 how many years?

1 MR. CRAIG: There are a number of
2 estimates. I think the best we're using now is 15
3 to 20 years.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Fifteen to
5 twenty years, okay. The last part is, is there
6 anything being done to prevent another occurrence
7 like Fernald, and there's other DOE sites, any
8 legislation being passed or anything at all?

9 MR. TILLER: I'll answer that.
10 There have been a number of sites and one of the
11 major initiatives that we have been focusing our
12 attention on is environmental safety and health.
13 So to answer your question, efforts in one aspect
14 or another similar to these are going on at
15 virtually all of the DOE sites, and they vary from
16 halting production activities until increased
17 levels of safety are achieved to addressing old
18 actions that have resulted in current problems. As
19 a matter of fact, actions that were taken 20 or 30
20 years ago which were deemed acceptable at the time
21 are no longer acceptable in accordance with current
22 regulations and DOE policy.

23 To answer your question, there are
24 significant actions across the DOE complex.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are they
2 willing to do an overhaul, like to basically stop
3 the process they're using now in favor of a more
4 environmentally conscious?

5 MR. TILLER: Many of the processes
6 have been overhauled and are being overhauled, to
7 use your words. The answer is, yes, I'm very
8 familiar with the Idaho facilities, to some extent
9 the Savannah River facilities, I know what's
10 happening at Rocky Flats and Hanford, and the
11 answer is yes.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just a last
13 little part to that, is there any federal
14 regulation being passed, do you know by chance?

15 MR. TILLER: I can almost guarantee
16 you there is.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. That's
18 cool.

19 MR. TILLER: And I don't mean to be
20 flip about it, but the regulations that have
21 evolved over the last, I would say 15 years, if you
22 look at the number of regulations in place or the
23 number of pages of regulations in place, it has
24 increased exponentially over that time period, and

1 it continues to be of high interest to the Congress
2 and the Department of Energy.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thanks.

4 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Thank you. The
5 next question.

6 MS. YOCUM: I'm Edwa Yocum, and I
7 live on State Route 128 and I have the Miami River
8 in my backyard, which I enjoy very much. And I
9 have a question. The original effluent outfall
10 pipeline, it has been discontinued due to some
11 technical difficulties in conducting a leak test.
12 How do you do this leak test?

13 MR. CRAIG: I'm not sure your first
14 statement -- usage of the effluent line continues.

15 MS. YOCUM: Well, the new one will
16 be constructed in 1992.

17 MR. CRAIG: That's correct.

18 MS. YOCUM: But in August of 1990
19 the original effluent line was A-OK as far as you
20 were concerned.

21 MR. CRAIG: Right.

22 MS. YOCUM: So now it's going to be
23 discontinued because it's not passing significant
24 technical difficulties in leak tests. Now, how do

1 you do the leak test and what is the difficulties?

2 MR. CRAIG: I'm not sure I can
3 answer that. I think there are -- maybe Rob can.
4 The new effluent line is being built as part of the
5 South Plume removal action, and one of the reasons
6 it is being built is because we're going to be
7 increasing the flow through that line to capacity
8 that the original line may not be able to handle
9 that flow, number one. Number two, you're right,
10 it's deteriorated, it's an old line. We had
11 manhole 180 overflow. I think that was talked
12 about a year ago or so. We're having some
13 problems. I think Robert can probably talk about
14 the testing that was done on the line.

15 MR. JANKE: Yeah. The --

16 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Robert, if you
17 could go to a mike.

18 MR. JANKE: Sure. Actually the
19 reason I shied away from that the last time over at
20 Meadowbrook, it echoed my voice around the room
21 very badly, so I was a little cautious of it this
22 time.

23 The existing effluent line is a
24 16-inch cast iron pipe that has approximately eight

1 8-foot sections. And the section between manhole
2 179 and 180 is this particular section that's
3 pointed out some difficulty. A pneumatic testing,
4 which is air testing, was done on that section of
5 the line as well from 175 to the Great Miami
6 River. The 179 to 180 was found to not hold a
7 pressure under the pneumatic test.

8 Now, a camera was sent down -- this
9 was, by the way, in July, April to July of 1990. A
10 camera was sent down the line to inspect it to see
11 if they could find out what the problem was, why it
12 didn't hold a pressure, and they found out that
13 some of the sections were just separated a little
14 bit that would not allow -- as a result pressure
15 would not be maintained in the line.

16 We submitted a characterization
17 report on that pressure testing to the Ohio and US
18 EPA, and they had some comments on that, that the
19 testing, we should have used some hydrostatic
20 testing.

21 After looking into additional testing
22 as well as the requirements of the new, the South
23 Plume removal action and the added volumes of water
24 that were going to be needed to be transported to

1 the Great Miami River, it was realized that the
2 best effort would be to put in a new line and
3 discontinue the old line. The existing line, as I
4 understand today, the only potential problem was
5 within that one section, and whether or not it's
6 leaking, we have characterization testing that's
7 being done on that of the soil and groundwater
8 around that section. Although it didn't hold a
9 pressure test, that still doesn't mean it's leaking
10 water because it's surrounded by a gravel packing
11 all the way done that was around that soil.

12 Testing, soil testing as well as
13 groundwater testing has been done south of manhole
14 180, which if there were, if contaminants were
15 leaking out, any substantial ones, you expect them
16 to flow along that channel to 180, and we haven't
17 seen any elevated concentration. So there's no
18 indication that there's a great leakage from that
19 line. If that answers your question.

20 MS. YOCUM: Thank you. I still have
21 another part of it. When you extend this pipeline
22 out to the river, in the last four or five years
23 the water table has been down considerably, and do
24 you take this in account, compared to let us say

1 the old pipeline probably now is in, is probably
2 almost, probably can see it because the water table
3 has gone down since the 1960's and the 1950's.
4 Now, would that other pipeline be extended further
5 out into the river?

6 MR. CRAIG: I think the OU-5 people
7 can probably answer that the best, they're really
8 the ones responsible for the South Plume design.
9 Carlos, you want to tackle that one?

10 MR. FERMAINTT: The new operable
11 line outlet structure, that will be designed by the
12 US Army Corps of Engineers. This is a structure,
13 as I mentioned to you, will take into consideration
14 the high level and the low level of the
15 groundwater, of the river water. The Corps has
16 taken information regarding hydrograph and levels
17 of the river, and they will take into consideration
18 that.

19 MS. YOCUM: But still as far as up
20 until 1992, the old effluent line is going to be
21 not as far out as far as with the water table
22 declining. So that's going to leave more
23 contamination laying on the bottom of the river
24 bed?

1 MR. CRAIG: I don't know the answer
2 to that, but I know of no plans to modify the
3 outfall, the outlet of the present outfall line.
4 We can look into that and get you an answer back.

5 MS. YOCUM: So we can almost
6 consider up until 1992 we're still going to have a
7 lot of contamination released from the plant during
8 the process of cleanup, and since you haven't got
9 the treatment plant finished, so there's still
10 going to be a lot of contaminated wastewater going
11 out to the river?

12 MR. CRAIG: There will be a large
13 volume of water going to the river which will have
14 some amount of uranium in it. We have committed
15 that that level will never increase, and we are
16 committed to reduce that level, but it will not be
17 zero. That will not get down to the levels you're
18 talking about until the advanced wastewater
19 treatment facility is on-line, you're right.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: I'm not -- this is
21 just -- I don't have to go to the mike for this
22 because it's just kind of a further explanation of
23 her question. What's the levels you've committed
24 yourself to?

1 MR. CRAIG: I think the present
2 levels ballpark are about 1,800 pounds per year of
3 uranium. We have committed to get that down after
4 the South Plume removal action has been initiated
5 to I believe 1,700 pounds per year, and are further
6 committed to reduce that as we can.

7 MS. YOCUM: Thank you.

8 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Next question,
9 please.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I had a
11 question, actually a comment and then two questions
12 perhaps. Perhaps US EPA or Ohio EPA might be best
13 suited to answer two of the questions I have.
14 First of all, my name is Andy, by the way, from
15 Green Peace.

16 Based on some information that I
17 gathered from talking to several people tonight
18 concerning the uranyl nitrate, based on
19 concentration in the tanks being at a hundred grams
20 per liter and based on there being about 200,000
21 gallons of that concentrate and then based on a
22 rough calculation of approximately 3 liters per
23 gallon and 99 percent precipitation removal
24 efficiency, which was effectively cited by I

1 believe a gentleman from WMCO, that still leaves
2 approximately, using some conversion factors here,
3 approximately 6,000,000 grams of uranium that would
4 be emitted into the river through that, based on
5 the figures that were given to me tonight. That
6 may seem like a small amount based on the overall
7 contamination in the area, but I think to the folks
8 in the area and I think to those of us who are very
9 concerned about the environment that does represent
10 a substantial amount of uranium.

11 Now, to the questions I had, first of
12 all, in terms of the long-term proposals for
13 removal of materials, are there any, is there any
14 consideration or possibility of on-site
15 incineration of any materials at FEMP right now?

16 MR. CRAIG: As far as incineration
17 goes, off the top of my head I can't remember any
18 of the alternatives that are being considered for
19 any of the operable units that included
20 incineration. I know that incineration was being
21 looked at in Operable Unit 2 to look at the
22 incineration of some of the material that's located
23 in the sanitary landfill on-site. And they're
24 looking I think at incineration of that trash in

1 the sanitary landfill. That's the only one that I
2 can think of off the top of my head they're even
3 considering in the treatability process. Maybe if
4 one of the other OU managers can correct me if I'm
5 wrong, but that's all that I know of right now.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The other
7 question I have I guess is going to be best suited
8 for the Ohio EPA folks or representatives here.
9 I've heard discussions, I've heard rumors, and I
10 have heard talk about the possibility of below
11 level radioactive waste sighting in this state, and
12 I was wondering if the gentleman from Ohio EPA knew
13 anything about that or cared to comment on that.

14 MR. MITCHELL: I know very little
15 about that. I know that the Governor of Ohio has
16 made some commitments for the Compack site for low
17 level waste but that is mostly for MRT regulated
18 material, which this waste at DOE sites right now
19 would not be permitted to go to.

20 I believe somebody from the Ohio
21 Department of Health is here tonight. They are
22 more in touch with the current status of the
23 Compack site that may or may not be located in the
24 State of Ohio. Michigan had a Compack site. They

1 basically defaulted on that agreement. Now Ohio
2 has picked that up. That's my understanding. Was
3 there a further question on that?

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I guess the
5 last question I would have to the general
6 attendance here is that I had based my initial
7 computations based on information that was given to
8 me by representatives here tonight, and if there
9 are any representatives who know better or
10 differently in terms of the amount of uranium that
11 would be emitted to the river as a result of the
12 removal, I would appreciate your identifying and
13 finding me and going over that.

14 MR. MITCHELL: I don't have any
15 particulars on that. I would like to hear some
16 more on that too, and I would like to hear someone
17 who knows more about the water treatment at the
18 Fernald facility. My guess is there's more
19 treatment involved after the initial
20 precipitation. I would like to have somebody from
21 Westinghouse or DOE to confirm that or deny that.

22 We've worked hard in negotiating with
23 DOE to make sure that the uranium levels do not
24 increase over their current levels, what they've

1 done in the last couple of years as far as
2 discharge. This is a tradeoff, this allows us to
3 make some progress at the site, allows us to begin
4 some removal actions. DOE has committed to
5 maintain that level. They've also committed to
6 install an advanced wastewater treatment facility,
7 which should go further to reduce the uranium
8 concentration being discharged to the river.

9 We've worked real hard so that no one
10 gets the idea that the Fernald site is being
11 cleaned up just by putting it into the river. That
12 is not the intention, and I would be glad to talk
13 to anyone who has that impression. As Jack Craig
14 said, we will probably never get to the point where
15 there is no uranium going to the river, but the
16 goal is to get that material very much lower than
17 it is now. Right now we're basically in a holding
18 pattern over the next couple of years. 1993, am I
19 correct, Jack, will be the start-up of the advanced
20 water water treatment facility?

21 MR. CRAIG: Yes.

22 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Next question.

23 MS. CRAWFORD: Mine has to do with
24 the uranyl nitrate, too. Jack, you put a thing up

1 there earlier that said you were going to process
2 it?

3 MR. CRAIG: Right.

4 MS. CRAWFORD: I need that explained
5 a little more because I don't understand what you
6 mean. When you use the word "process," are you
7 going to process it through a plant or --

8 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Would you like to
9 see the slide back up there?

10 MS. CRAWFORD: Yeah, if we could.

11 MR. CRAIG: We are not going to be
12 operating the facility that did this process when
13 the plant was operating.

14 MS. CRAWFORD: But that's not my --
15 I know that because you're not going to start back
16 up, I know that. I don't understand how you're
17 going to do this. Can you explain this to me?

18 MR. CRAIG: It's going to be blended
19 in tanks basically.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: What kind of tanks?

21 MR. CRAIG: Robert, you want to
22 explain a little bit. I think you're talking about
23 a process where you're adding chemicals into tanks,
24 sending it through a filter, and the chemical

1 process of adding the magnesium will precipitate or
2 remove the uranium. As far as the construction of
3 the tanks, I don't have that information.

4 MS. CRAWFORD: So you're going to
5 have to build all this before you can actually
6 process it?

7 MR. CRAIG: It already exists.

8 MS. CRAWFORD: It's already there?

9 MR. CRAIG: Right.

10 MS. CRAWFORD: Maybe a better
11 question is why do we have this uranyl nitrate to
12 begin with, what was it used for?

13 MR. CRAIG: It was a product, an
14 intermediate process that was left over from
15 production. The material was never used and never
16 processed when the plant was shut down.

17 MS. CRAWFORD: So it's just like
18 leftover stuff.

19 MR. CRAIG: Right.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay, so you're going
21 to process it through this stabilization process,
22 and what you're going to end up with is filter cake
23 that you're going to store in barrels on Pad 1, I'm
24 presuming.

1 MR. CRAIG: Correct.

2 MS. CRAWFORD: And then the rest of
3 it is going to go into the general sump into the
4 river, and that's where -- I want to know if his
5 numbers are right, and, if not, what are the
6 correct numbers. If somebody could quickly work
7 that up for me, I would appreciate it.

8 MR. CRAIG: We will try to get that
9 answer for you before we leave tonight. I spoke to
10 the gentleman earlier. I think we can get a better
11 answer on that. From what I understand, the
12 precipitation process to remove the uranium is
13 about a 99 percent efficient process. Once that
14 liquid has the uranium precipitated out of it, it
15 also going through another treatment system, the
16 plant effluent treatment system, that treats the
17 water again down to about half a part per million
18 of uranium.

19 MR. JANKE: I think that was
20 neglected, possibly neglected in his calculation.

21 MS. CRAWFORD: How many gallons of
22 this or tons or whatever?

23 MR. CRAIG: Approximately 200,000
24 gallons.

1 MS. CRAWFORD: Somebody write that
2 down for me, 200,000 gallons.

3 The second question I have is you
4 talked a little bit earlier about gaining process
5 to private property for the South Plume stuff. I
6 thought that that was all taken care of. I thought
7 the Justice Department took care of all of those
8 access problems to private property.

9 MR. CRAIG: Well, they haven't. We
10 did refer a number of cases to the Department of
11 Justice for certain actions. I think the ones
12 you're familiar with are the access referral that
13 we did for the RI/FS investigations. That was
14 something separate from the access we needed for
15 the South Plume removal action, and that really
16 involves getting access to construct a pipeline on
17 private property, to install the extraction wells
18 to the South Plume, and to do further
19 investigations under part 5 of the South Plume. We
20 have gained I think most of the access that we need
21 to those properties. I think for the South Plume
22 there are about three to four outstanding private
23 property owners that have not allowed us access.

24 MS. CRAWFORD: Are you offering to

1 reimburse them?

2 MR. CRAIG: I'm not sure what the
3 number is, but there are payments made for use of
4 the property for certain activities, yes. Some of
5 the people are just not interested in having
6 anything done on the property.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Addressing
8 that without getting up there, can't you use
9 eminent domain?

10 MR. CRAIG: We can, yes, we can.
11 That's what we will probably be doing. First we
12 have to go through the process of trying to gain
13 voluntary access. If that doesn't work, there's
14 another process under CERCLA where we can refer the
15 parties to the Department of Justice, and the
16 properties owners can be sued by the Government to
17 allow us to gain access.

18 MS. CRAWFORD: Is this going to
19 again put a kink in things or hold things up?

20 MR. CRAIG: It has the potential of
21 doing that. We don't have a lot of control over
22 those cases once they go to the Department of
23 Justice. That's not a fast process.

24 MS. CRAWFORD: Oh, I can imagine, I

1 can well imagine. Golly, the red tape we go
2 through around here, I hate to deal with the
3 Justice Department, gee.

4 The last question I have again is
5 with the Safe Shutdown Program. That's a major
6 concern of mine and every time we have a RI/FS
7 meeting I talk about that because our fear is that
8 you're going to start-up again, you're going to
9 finish producing some stuff maybe that you had out
10 there. There's a lot of questions and concerns and
11 I don't need to reiterate them all over again
12 tonight, but I don't think anybody has actually
13 addressed that concern or that issue, and I think
14 it's a real important issue that needs to be talked
15 about, it needs to be explained step by step
16 through the process, how you're going to do this.
17 I don't know who's in charge of that, but I would
18 like to have some -- Is that Ray?

19 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Yeah, I was going
20 to ask Ray if he could come up. There's a work
21 plan for the removal action that is due I believe
22 in early November that will have more specific
23 information, but Ray --

24 MS. CRAWFORD: Can we have a copy of

1 that work plan?

2 MR. HANSEN: Yes, I will get you a
3 copy. I think would be a good idea if we go ahead
4 and present that detail by detail at the next
5 meeting, but we'll get you a copy in the interim.

6 MR. CRAIG: That work plan will be
7 in the public reading room I believe at the end of
8 this week.

9 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: And, Lisa, I think
10 as you mentioned, it's not a matter of producing,
11 or when you're starting up this safe shutdown at
12 the facility, you're not actually producing
13 anymore, it's just simply flushing out the system.

14 MS. CRAWFORD: But there's a big
15 concern, we're very skeptical and we're not a real
16 trusting lot of people after everything we've been
17 through, and that is a concern of ours.

18 MR. CRAIG: I think that may be a
19 good topic for one of the community round tables.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: Yes, I think that
21 would be an excellent topic for a round table.

22 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Done deal. Next
23 question.

24 MS. YOCUM: This is back on the

1 uranyl nitrate. It said on the diagram that it was
2 going to be made into filter cakes. Then in the
3 green piece of people, Operable Unit 3, it says
4 that the uranyl nitrate is going to be neutralized
5 and converted into a solid form. Then talking with
6 another person in the back, said it was going to be
7 a sludge form. Now, I mean, we all know what each
8 one of those forms are, and I'm sure that the solid
9 form sure does not sound like sludge, and I don't
10 think a solid form doesn't remind me of filter
11 cakes. So I'm just wondering what form is it going
12 to take on?

13 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Rob, do you want
14 to answer that. I would think off the top of my
15 head that sludge is more solid than liquid, but let
16 me have Rob give a delineation of that.

17 MR. JANKE: Well, I think in
18 addition to this slide, I think maybe it would be
19 good to back up a minute and address Lisa's comment
20 earlier on the actual blending of the tanks. There
21 was a slide that Jack had earlier on the uranyl
22 nitrate tanks immediately south of the Plant 1 ore
23 silos, those four tanks. If you wouldn't mind
24 putting that up..

1 One question was on the way the
2 uranyl nitrate was going to be blended. There's a
3 total of 20 tanks of uranyl nitrate on-site that
4 are going to be processed through this removal
5 action. These four tanks, two of which you can see
6 in the photo, will be part of that batch
7 operation. Of the 20 tanks, there's going to be 13
8 batches, so they're going to be basically blended
9 in the tanks that they sit in. They're not going
10 to be transferred to another tank and then blended
11 there. Of the 20 total tanks, there's 13 batches.
12 The idea is to mix those because the isotopic
13 concentration of Uranium 235 varies between the
14 tanks, so you want a homogenous mixture. That will
15 be heated in the tanks, and then it will be
16 precipitated after it's heated. It's heated in
17 order to get all the uranium in the solution before
18 you precipitate it so you can increase the
19 precipitation process.

20 After it's precipitated, you're then
21 going to have to filter off the precipitate from
22 the liquid, so we're going to have a filter cake
23 that's developed from that filter process as well
24 as that uranium will become a sludge. There's no

1 plan to run that sludge through a drying bed or
2 anything. That will go in drums and it will be
3 stored on the Plant 1 pad.

4 So that's -- I don't know if that
5 answers your question fully, but when it was used
6 as a solid form, it was meant a sludge.

7 MS. YOCUM: Okay, that's what I
8 mean, I think you could have said sludge. We all
9 are familiar with that word.

10 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Next question.

11 MR. LERNER: Hello, my name is Matt
12 Lerner. I'm a student at Miami University, and I
13 have a question about these drums. You mentioned,
14 Mr. Craig, that about 240,000 drums had been
15 removed from the facility.

16 MR. CRAIG: Drum equivalents of
17 waste.

18 MR. LERNER: Okay. Is this solid
19 waste or sludge or filter cakes?

20 MR. CRAIG: Most of it is solid
21 waste.

22 MR. LERNER: What's being done with
23 it?

24 MR. CRAIG: That material is

1 disposed of at the Nevada test site, which is an
2 approved, licensed low level waste disposal
3 facility.

4 MR. LERNER: Thank you.

5 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Next question.
6 Carlos, you're not allowed to ask questions.

7 MR. FERMAINTT: I just have a
8 clarification here. Earlier tonight Jack Craig
9 mentioned that the interim plan wastewater
10 treatment facility will increase capacity from 150
11 GPM to 300 GPM. The reality is it will be
12 increased from 150 to 400 GPM. This system, that
13 capacity will be provided by having two units
14 installed at the stormwater retention basin, each
15 one with 150 GPM. And the 10 GPM pilot treatment
16 facility that was used as a pilot particularly for
17 the advanced wastewater treatment, that will be
18 converted to a hundred GPM system that will be
19 installed at the facility.

20 MR. WESTERBECK: Carlos, I think
21 Jack -- I think maybe we need to clarify one other
22 thing. I believe Jack mentioned that we currently
23 estimate that we discharge around 1,800 pounds of
24 uranium per year to the river and we're planning to

1 reduce that through this interim treatment system
2 to 1,700. My understanding is that those plants in
3 the capacities you were talking about is going to
4 reduce it more than just a hundred pounds per year,
5 but something like 3, 4, 500 pounds per year.

6 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: As we
7 negotiated the dispute resolution with the State of
8 Ohio and US EPA, the problem was with these removal
9 actions, the South Plume removal action, the waste
10 pit area removal action, and some of these
11 additional removal actions, there was a potential
12 that we would actually increase the rate of the
13 amount of uranium that would be discharged. So
14 what we have done in that agreement, these interim
15 advance wastewater, or these interim advance
16 wastewater treatment systems will treat enough
17 uranium so that indeed with the increase that we
18 would get from these removal actions, we would
19 still remain below the 1,862 and indeed have enough
20 excess to actually decrease that number to 1,700
21 pounds. So theoretically we are going to treat
22 more than a hundred pound difference. We're going
23 to be treating -- there's a 162 pound difference.
24 We'll also be treating the equivalent mass for the

1 other removal actions. So it's a potential to go
2 up. So we're going to match that plus overshoot
3 that 162 pounds.

4 And the reason it's called an interim
5 advanced wastewater treatment, again in
6 negotiations, the advanced wastewater treatment
7 facility that we are trying to get on-line will
8 treat all the existing effluent from the plant,
9 which will significantly impact that 1,862 pounds,
10 drop that down drastically, but that won't occur
11 until late '93 when we get the advanced wastewater
12 treatment system on-line. So the agreement we made
13 was to bring in these interim systems, again
14 interim, they're only temporary to be utilized
15 until we can get the advanced wastewater treatment
16 system in. So at that point once the advanced
17 wastewater treatment system is in, again, as Graham
18 had mentioned earlier, we're talking the tiered
19 approach, we're at the 1,862 level now, we're going
20 to drop that to 1,700 pounds with the interim
21 system, even with the additional removal actions.
22 Then in late '93, early '94 when the advanced
23 wastewater treatment system goes in, we'll take
24 another significant drop in that number.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How much
2 radium are you releasing to the river?

3 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: How much radium
4 you said?

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How much
6 radium.

7 MR. CRAIG: I don't know. We have
8 those numbers we can get you. It's part of our
9 monthly reporting I believe to the state. I'm not
10 sure.

11 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: It's in the
12 Annual Environmental Report.

13 MR. JANKE: It's a lot less than
14 uranium.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It better be.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: Does anybody know
17 when last year's Environmental Monitoring Report
18 will be ready? Nobody knows.

19 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: I know right now
20 we've had a little bit of a problem with getting
21 back some of the assembly data, that's what has
22 been holding it up, completing the report. Maybe
23 Jerry can add something to that.

24 MR. WESTERBECK: I saw -- Behran,

1 are you brushing away flies or waiving to answer?
2 We just got the draft report from Westinghouse.
3 Now it does include all of the analytical results,
4 and do you know the schedule?

5 MR. SHROFF: Except for some of the
6 end results, all the other data is available, and
7 we expect to get the final report from Westinghouse
8 on the 8th of November. And then it will be sent
9 to headquarters and it will be approved and
10 released.

11 MS. CRAWFORD: That could take quite
12 a long time now, couldn't it? We've waited for
13 things to go back from headquarters before. They
14 go on this huge desk somewhere and nobody seems to
15 be able to find them.

16 MR. SHROFF: We have somebody from
17 headquarters here today, maybe they could address
18 that.

19 MS. CRAWFORD: Is there really
20 somebody here from headquarters?

21 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Yes.

22 MS. CRAWFORD: I think they should
23 be introduced.

24 MR. CRAIG: I'll go ahead and

1 introduce them. The representatives we have are
2 from the Fernald Environmental Management Project
3 branch at headquarters that report to Kim Hays,
4 reports to Jim Fiori, Pat Whitfield who reports to
5 Leo Duffy. Anyway, Brad Wright works in that
6 branch. Brad was here for our meeting with U.S.
7 and Ohio EPA today also, and David Yockman is here
8 with Brad, he's also in that branch.

9 MS. CRAWFORD: You tell them folks
10 up in Washington not to lose those reports on those
11 great big desks of theirs.

12 MR. CRAIG: I might add that Brad
13 and Dave's groups are not responsible for approval
14 of those reports.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just carry
16 the messages.

17 MS. CRAWFORD: Carry the messages,
18 right.

19 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Next question.

20 MR. CLAWSON: I'm Marvin Clawson,
21 and I wonder about the new wastewater treatment
22 plant, does it take care of volatiles in case you
23 pick up from Nease Chemical and Albright & Wilson?
24 Have you got ways of taking care of volatiles?

1 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: Again, the
2 advanced wastewater treatment plant that we're
3 currently in design for is to treat our existing
4 waste waters. We are going to have carbon
5 absorption in that system to take care of organics
6 in our own system. Again, in the South Plume area,
7 what we talked about earlier this evening, we are
8 relocating that ball field from our initial
9 location because of the Paddy's Run Road site
10 contaminants. Again, we will just address uranium
11 in the first part of this removal action. In the
12 future, the expansion to treat the South Plume,
13 would have to address those organics, and we'll
14 have to work with the Paddy's Run Road site.

15 MR. CRAIG: If for some unforeseen
16 reason, we have no plans of this right now, if for
17 some reason we did agree to pump that water
18 including the organics back to the site from the
19 Paddy's Run Road site, we would treat that water.
20 That water would not get discharged without
21 treatment.

22 MS. NUNGESTER: I got to follow-up
23 on that. There's one problem with that. I don't
24 have the technical term for it, but there are

1 chemicals in those two places are marrying and
2 producing new chemicals or having babies, as I like
3 to call it. How are you going to know how to take
4 those out?

5 MR. MITCHELL: I'm just going to say
6 I think that at this point we need to remember that
7 those two sites are under a separate study, a
8 separate remediation study to determine the extent
9 of contamination, basically the same study that DOE
10 is doing, is being overseen by the State of Ohio on
11 that site, and they're going to have to come up
12 with their own way of treating that material.
13 You're absolutely right in that there may be some
14 overlap of contaminants that will have to be
15 treated together. DOE will be responsible for
16 whatever they contributed and the Paddy's Run Road
17 sites will be responsible for what they have. So
18 there may be some facility that may have to be a
19 cooperative effort. I'm speculating here, but this
20 is a significant problem, especially from the
21 material that will be downgradient from the
22 extraction levels.

23 MS. NUNGESTER: We're not blaming
24 them for their contamination in those two

1 companies, but the problem is are they going to be
2 able to treat the stuff if you happen to pull it up
3 with your material?

4 MR. MITCHELL: As Jack said, if they
5 happen to pull it up, they will have to
6 characterize it and treat it, but right now the
7 idea is to keep them separated until we determine
8 the best way to handle that when the Paddy's Run
9 Road site finishes their investigation. The
10 contamination from Paddy's Run Road is significant,
11 very significant.

12 MS. NUNGESTER: That was the first--
13 I don't know whether it was the first or the second
14 question that somebody wrote on the card that they
15 were asking, there are two plumes in the area.
16 Nobody brought that out, there are two plumes, one
17 from the two companies which does not have any
18 connection with the DOE site, and then the DOE
19 plume. If that person is still here, that will
20 give them somewhat of an answer.

21 MR. MITCHELL: That's correct.

22 MS. NUNGESTER: Thanks.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there
24 going to be a public meeting on those two

1 companies?

2 MR. MITCHELL: I'm saying we're
3 going to have a public meeting on that facility
4 when they get done with their remedial
5 investigation. Unfortunately, we keep going in
6 different phases and keep expanding such as we've
7 had here with DOE. The extent of contamination
8 really hasn't been totally identified, so we keep
9 putting additional wells in, additional phases. So
10 the goal is to have one of those, and I will pass
11 that message on to the site coordinator of that
12 project, that the people down here are still very
13 interested in that. I would encourage you to push
14 that issue too.

15 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Next question.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm back. Is
17 there any possibility that contaminants could move
18 through the water table down to Cincinnati or any
19 other areas, and, if so, what are you doing to
20 arrest this possibility?

21 MR. CRAIG: I think -- well, from
22 what we've found so far in the RI/FS, I think as
23 Carlos said, the contamination south of the
24 facility in the groundwater runs very close down to

1 New Haven Road south of the plant. It's estimated
2 to be moving about 200 feet per year through the
3 groundwater. Right now we don't see any potential
4 for that groundwater to migrate to the City of
5 Cincinnati. So I guess the answer to your question
6 is no.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay,
8 thanks.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My questions
10 sort of give you an opportunity to answer one of
11 Lisa's comments about Yucca Mountain, I'm assuming
12 that's the Nevada site she's talking about.

13 MS. CRAWFORD: It's one of them.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm
15 interested in knowing if the Fernald high level
16 waste is going there, what is the progress of the
17 Yucca Mountain site, are there other sites, and if
18 Fernald waste is not going there and it is such a
19 high priority, whose waste is? And I don't know if
20 that's a general question for US EPA or a higher
21 level DOE. I know it's not very specific for what
22 Fernald is doing, I'm just interested in knowing.

23 MS. CRAWFORD: I can answer the
24 Yucca Mountain questions.

1 MR. TILLER: We at Fernald have high
2 level waste. The Yucca Mountain facility is
3 designed to be a repository principally for
4 commercial waste, commercial reactives. There are
5 provisions that some limited portions that can be
6 used for Department of Energy high level waste that
7 was associated with our defense activities. A
8 progress report I can't give you, I'm sorry.

9 MR. CRAIG: To make it clear, Yucca
10 Mountain is not where we're sending our waste.
11 Yucca Mountain is not operating.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I know that,
13 I was wondering if it was possibly going there.

14 MR. CRAIG: None of our waste is
15 planned to go to Yucca Mountain. We have no high
16 level waste at the site. All our waste is low
17 level radioactive waste.

18 MS. CRAWFORD: But the low level
19 radioactive waste goes to the Nevada test site.

20 MR. CRAIG: That's right.

21 MS. CRAWFORD: And Yucca Mountain is
22 located on the Nevada test site.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

24 MS. CRAWFORD: I know, it's very

1 confusing.

2 MR. CLAWSON: Will the WIPP site
3 take high level waste when it gets in operation?

4 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: I don't know.

5 MR. CLAWSON: Is it scheduled to
6 take high level as well as transgenal waste?

7 MR. TILLER: No.

8 MS. NUNGESTER: They're already
9 shipping it.

10 MR. TILLER: Just transgenal waste.

11 MR. CRAIG: And none of our waste is
12 scheduled to go to WIPP either.

13 MR. MEYER: My name is Don Meyer. I
14 think I have a concern relative to Graham's
15 response before in reference to the Paddy's Run
16 site project and how that is going to affect the
17 cleanup of the South Plume. I'm wondering if we
18 can't get a commitment from the Ohio EPA to have a
19 public meeting where we can address what's going on
20 at the Paddy's Run cleanup site. Because of the
21 mixture of the two chemicals, the chemicals coming
22 from your facility and the chemicals coming from
23 the Albright Wilson, Ruetgers-Nease plant, the
24 combination of those facilities, the contaminants

1 from those various facilities, we've created such a
2 complex mix there that you really can't correct
3 that problem unless we fully know what's going on
4 there. I'm wondering whether or not we can't have
5 some kind of a commitment to have a public meeting
6 where we can address what's going on there so that
7 there can be some inter-reaction between the two
8 cleanup actions.

9 MS. CRAWFORD: I want to second
10 that, Graham.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Third.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Fourth.

13 MR. MITCHELL: I agree, I think the
14 time has come to have a public meeting on this
15 issue. We've probably been dragging our feet on
16 this, trying to get an agreement worked out with
17 them, but I think enough time has passed. Why
18 don't we try and I will get back to you, Don, I'll
19 get back to you, Lisa, let's try to shoot for a
20 public meeting before March of next year. Is that
21 acceptable?

22 MS. CRAWFORD: That's acceptable.
23 If it has to come from us, you need to let us know
24 so we can put the pressure on them.

1 MR. MITCHELL: I will do that.

2 MS. CRAWFORD: They've been hiding
3 behind the wall for about a year and a half now.

4 MR. MITCHELL: I agree, it's time.
5 Let's try to shoot for a target sometime between
6 now and March. It will definitely be after the
7 first of the year I'm sure, and I will get back to
8 you, both of you as far as whether or not that's
9 doable, and I think it is.

10 MS. CRAWFORD: And I don't think DOE
11 should be responsible for anything of those
12 companies because I see that as a huge liability, a
13 legal liability. I see some real legal problems
14 that could come from those two combining, trying to
15 do things together, because ultimately you guys,
16 DOE, is going to end up footing the bill for those
17 two companies, and that is not fair because it's
18 taxpayers' money that's going to foot the bill and
19 let Albright Wilson, Ruetgers-Nease foot their own
20 damn bill.

21 MR. CRAIG: It sounds like you need
22 a public meeting on it.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are you going
24 to be there?

1 MR. MEYER: As a follow-up, I'm not
2 sure, maybe you can answer this, whether we really
3 know what the effect of the mix is between all of
4 those chemicals in terms of pumping them out,
5 whether or not they're going to be able to be
6 treated properly, whether or not we know all the
7 answers. It sounds like we have a complex mess
8 here that really hasn't been addressed and needs to
9 be addressed because the South Plume is one of the
10 most compelling problem that we have. We have
11 nothing but a mishmash over there of chemicals that
12 we really are not sure what's going to happen with
13 them.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's right.

15 MR. MITCHELL: I think you're
16 right. I think it's a definite concern. I think,
17 and I am just, I'll make an educated guess here,
18 but the real concern of Paddy's Run Road
19 contamination is going to be the volatile organics
20 and the other inorganics in that plume. The
21 uranium, if you remember from our earlier meetings,
22 the uranium is, that's the area of the South Plume
23 that is really not highly concentrated, not highly
24 contaminated. It's of concern, but the volatile

1 organics are there and there is pure product in
2 some of the wells that we're sampling out there,
3 material floating on top of the aquifer.

4 So we're not talking about
5 insignificant amounts of contamination here, and
6 basically Lisa is absolutely right, that they need
7 to accept responsibility for their contamination.

8 MS. CRAWFORD: We're talking about
9 some bad stuff here, Graham. We're talking about
10 benzene, xylene, toluene --

11 MR. MITCHELL: Cumene,
12 isopropylbenzene, arsenic.

13 MS. CRAWFORD: The list is a mile
14 long.

15 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Any further
16 questions?

17 Well, gee, it's only 20 of 10:00.
18 This is a short meeting. If we don't have any
19 further questions, we can conclude the meeting and
20 the site personnel will be available for a short
21 time in the exhibit area if anyone wants to ask any
22 further questions. Thank you very much for
23 coming.

24 - - -

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, LOIS A. ROELL, RPR, the undersigned, a
notary public-court reporter, do hereby certify
that at the time and place stated herein, I
recorded in stenotypy and thereafter had
transcribed with computer-aided transcription the
within (97), ninety-seven pages, and that the
foregoing transcript of proceedings is a complete
and accurate report of my said stenotypy notes.

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: LOIS A. ROELL, RPR

AUGUST 12, 1992.

NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF OHIO